UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/717,434	11/18/2003	Charlotte Albaek Thrue	22460-010001 / 1015US1	7002	
²⁶¹⁶¹ FISH & RICHA	7590 02/17/200 ARDSON PC	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 1022		VIVLEMORE, TRACY ANN			
MIINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1635		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/17/2009	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/717,434	THRUE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	emore	1635					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the o	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same da application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) a application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with application Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. To periods:	in amendment, affidavit eal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>6</u> months from the mailing date of the final rej b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHE MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the p	n, or (2) the date set forth i MONTHS from the mailing ECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	on. LED WITHIN TWO				
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened state set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	e corresponding amount outory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>08 January 2009</u> . A brief in compliathe date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extensappeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be file <u>AMENDMENTS</u>	sion thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disn	nissal of the				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to th (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration a (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);			cause				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for a appeal; and/or			ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspondin NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attacts Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	ched Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if sulfunction non-allowable claim(s). 		•	-				
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 43,47-51 and 55-96.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or or because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient rewas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of A entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was no	rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the statu REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	us of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT See Continuation Sheet.	place the application in	condition for allowand	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:							
	cy Vivlemore/ nary Examiner, Art U	nit 1635					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants traverse the examiner's characterization of the Wahlestedt reference by arguing that Wahlestedt defines "non-oxy-LNA" as including other types of locked nucleic acids and therefore is not limited to oligonucleotides having alternating locked and non-locked nucleotides.

The examiner acknowledges that Wahlestedt embraces oligonucleotides having only locked nucleotides, but the reference nevertheless specifically contemplates combining locked nucleotides with DNA and RNA.

Applicants further argue that the rejection is based on routine optimization of what is disclosed by Wahlestedt and presents arguments why the oligonucleotides of Wahlestedt do not explicitly disclose the claimed genus.

Applicant's assertion that the rejection is based on the routine optimization of what is disclosed in Wahlestedt is incorrect; the rejection is based on the combined teachings of Wahlestedt and Crooke. While it is correct that the XYXY pattern claimed by applicants is not the only pattern contemplated by Wahlestedt, it is well known to those in the antisense art that the ability of an oligonucleotide to activate RNase H is a critical consideration. Wahlestedt recognizes the importance of this property, teaching at pages 8-9 that oligonucleotides with both oxy-LNA and non-oxy-LNA monomers may have RNase H activity that is the same as or different from all LNA oligonucleotides. Wahlestedt teaches that non-oxy-LNA monomers can be used to purposely change the RNase H activity of oligonucleotides; this would clearly be done by changing the number and position of the non-oxy-LNA monomers.